

-7-

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prager in view of Peterson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant's claims recite a method in which requesting and delivering software applications do not know *a priori* the exact definition of information to be exchanged. Requesting and delivering software applications negotiate an information exchange format.

On the other hand, Prager teaches a method of accessing information in which the requester (i.e., activity 24) need only request. Delivery software (i.e., link 28 and conversion object 20) deliver converted information to activity 24. In more detail, link 28 creates a stream object 20 containing the information, a reference to the character set, and a pointer to the location of the information. Conversion object 22 converts the information using the character set and delivers the converted information to activity 24.

Thus, with respect to claim 1, Prager fails to disclose

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

-8-

publishing a list of one or more data fields used by  
one or more software applications;  
mapping the published data fields;  
flagging mapped data fields by at least one of the  
one or more software applications;

While Peterson may disclose a tree structure associated  
with a document in translation, Peterson does not teach or  
suggest use of the tree structure as a basis for comparing  
data fields common to two software applications.

Applicant has added new claim 13.

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims  
be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul W. Martin  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,870  
(937) 445-2990

JAN 25 2005

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**